

Message

From: Goodlander, Douglas [dgoodlande@pa.gov]
Sent: 6/28/2019 3:07:20 PM
To: Royer, Matthew B [mzr154@psu.edu]; Chris Sigmund [ChrisS@teamaginc.com]; John J. Bell [jjbell@pfb.com]; 'Jill Whitcomb' [JillWhitcomb@lancasterconservation.org]
CC: Hostetter, Gregory [grhostette@pa.gov]; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@hotmail.com; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@centurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@embarqmail.com; jdrafarm@frontier.com; Brown, Karl [kbrown@pa.gov]; Jennifer Reed-Harry [jrharry@pennag.com]; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Baker, Jordan [c-jorbaker@pa.gov]; Trentacoste, Emily [trentacoste.emily@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: [External] RE: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

This wording from Matt and Chris looks fine to me as well.

dag

Douglas Goodlander | Environmental Program Manager, Operations Division
Department of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Clean Water
Rachel Carson State Office Building
400 Market Street | Harrisburg, PA 17101
P: 717.772.0141 | F: 717.772.4474
www.dep.pa.gov

From: Royer, Matthew B <mzr154@psu.edu>
Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 10:23 AM
To: Chris Sigmund <ChrisS@teamaginc.com>; John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>; 'Jill Whitcomb' <JillWhitcomb@lancasterconservation.org>
Cc: Goodlander, Douglas <dgoodlande@pa.gov>; Hostetter, Gregory <grhostette@pa.gov>; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@hotmail.com; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@centurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com; [Ex: 6 Personal Privacy (PP)]@embarqmail.com; jdrafarm@frontier.com; Brown, Karl <kbrown@pa.gov>; Jennifer Reed-Harry <jrharry@pennag.com>; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>
Subject: [External] RE: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Thanks Chris for weighing in here. I for one am fine with Chris' proposed revisions to the language. A good example of the efficiencies of these approaches, which can take many different forms!

Best,
Matt

Matt Royer
Director, Agriculture and Environment Center
Penn State University
College of Agricultural Sciences
111B Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-8756

mroyer@psu.edu
www.agsci.psu.edu/aec

From: Chris Sigmund <ChrisS@teamaginc.com>

Sent: Friday, June 28, 2019 9:45 AM

To: Royer, Matthew B <mzr154@psu.edu>; John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>; 'Jill Whitcomb' <JillWhitcomb@lanasterconservation.org>

Cc: dgoodlande@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; [\[REDACTED\]@hotmail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@hotmail.com); [\[REDACTED\]@centurylink.net](mailto:[REDACTED]@centurylink.net); jamesharbach@hotmail.com; [\[REDACTED\]@embarqmail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@embarqmail.com); jdrafarm@frontier.com; kbrown@pa.gov; Jennifer Reed-Harry <jrharry@pennag.com>; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lanasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

Matt, Jill, and John,

Thank you for your efforts to address my comments from the other day. I made a few suggested change to Matt's paragraph pertaining to block grants. The changes are highlighted in yellow.

I believe the change I suggested will help to ensure the pursuit of public/private partnerships and help to ensure the mobilization of existing "boots on the ground" to meet current demands.

I offer the below example to illustrate the power of competition as we pursue cost effective solutions to help farmers.

In 2018 Lancaster County Ag Land Preservation (LCALP) published an RFP for the completion of conservation status reviews on all of the farms in the county where they hold easements. I understand that three entities (one public and two private) responded to the RFP. LCALP board of directors determined that one of the two private entities was the most qualified applicant. The most qualified applicant also offered to lowest cost. LCALP awarded a contract (\$30,000/year for 3 years with an option for 2 additional years) to the lowest and most qualified applicate. It is my understanding that this work (same scope) was historically completed by a well know public entity with "mixed" results at a cost of \$50,000/year. The net result is LCALP is now receiving the intend results at a lower cost. Over the course of the contract they will save up to \$100,000 or \$20,000 per year or 40 percent. Perhaps they will use these saving to finance the installation of farm management practices or hire a plan writer.

Can the \$9 million in block grants be managed, at least in part, in a similar way so we can extract as much value as possible out of this limited pot of funds.

Best regards,

Chris

From: Royer, Matthew B [<mailto:mzr154@psu.edu>]

Sent: Thursday, June 27, 2019 2:54 PM

To: Chris Sigmund <ChrisS@teamaginc.com>; John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>

Cc: dgoodlande@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; [\[REDACTED\]@hotmail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@hotmail.com); [\[REDACTED\]@centurylink.net](mailto:[REDACTED]@centurylink.net); jamesharbach@hotmail.com; [\[REDACTED\]@embarqmail.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@embarqmail.com); jdrafarm@frontier.com; kbrown@pa.gov; Jennifer Reed-Harry <jrharry@pennag.com>; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lanasterconservation.org; jshuler@farmerspride.com; Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

Hi John and all,

I have completed my review of the report and I think it is a very strong document. Thanks to all! Thank you John for riding herd on this and making the review process as painless as possible.

I have only very minor comments (typos really) and some suggested language to address Chris Sigmund's comments on 11a (block grant concept). I fully agree with Chris' comments. Please see the additional language suggested below to address these comments.

MATT'S COMMENTS ON THE REPORT:

1. Page 3, second full paragraph, first sentence: change "TMDL goal" to "TMDL goals" or "the TMDL goal."
2. Page 20, comment 9, paragraph in blue highlighted text: use same font size throughout.
3. Page 22, comment 11a. Suggest the following language additions (in blue) to address Chris Sigmund's comment:

Block grant funding to conservation districts for agriculture BMPs –The fluidity associated with designing and funding agricultural BMPs creates a need to be able to repurpose or reallocate funding originally assigned to one farm practice to another rapidly. Historic state funding mechanisms allocating funding to specific farms for very specific BMPs has been found to not be a practical approach to funding agricultural BMPs to the extent needed to meet PA's BMP implementation goals. A new funding scenario is recommended to be initiated where state BMP implementation dollars would be allocated to participating conservation districts through a block grant system. Under this system the state would provide an annual predetermined funding level to each conservation district based on a set of program metrics, and would set general parameters on the district's authority to utilize block allocation of funding provided. The conservation district would be given reasonable discretion to determine and prioritize the proportionate amounts of disbursement of funds to assist farm conservation practices and local conservation measures. Reasonable levels of support for critical but often underfunded tasks like grant administration and management and farmer education and outreach could be considered as part of this flexibility. County conservation districts shall actively pursue ~~should strongly consider pursuing~~ public/private partnerships to enhance the cost effective delivery of such funds. Through this approach, counties will be enabled to respond quickly to farmers having an identified need to improve environmental quality on their farms. Counties will also be enabled under this program to tailor and coordinate conservation measures that addresses conditions and characteristics that are unique to each county and will facilitate and encourage more timely BMP implementation.

Matt Royer
Director, Agriculture and Environment Center
Penn State University
College of Agricultural Sciences
111B Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-8756
mroyer@psu.edu
www.agsci.psu.edu/aec

From: Chris Sigmund <ChrisS@teamaginc.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 26, 2019 4:59 PM

To: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>

Cc: dgoodlande@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; Royer, Matthew B <mzr154@psu.edu>; [\[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy \(PP\)\]@hotmail.com](mailto:[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy (PP)]@hotmail.com);

[\[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy \(PP\)\]@centurylink.net](mailto:[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy (PP)]@centurylink.net); jamesharbach@hotmail.com; [\[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy \(PP\)\]@embarqmail.com](mailto:[Ex: 5 Personal Privacy (PP)]@embarqmail.com); jdrafarm@frontier.com;

kbrown@pa.gov; Jennifer Reed-Harry <jrharry@pennag.com>; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org;

ishuler@farmerspride.com; Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: FRIENDLY REMINDER - SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES TO VERSION 3 DRAFT AG WORKGROUP FINAL REPORT

John,

I have completed my review of the report.

My only comment pertains to number 11.a. (block grants).

I made a number of comments at the last meeting relating to this topic. My comments were not included in the report so I'll mention them again. In general, I'm hoping block grants can achieve the outcomes outlined in this section. I hope the money can be used efficiently to improve farm profitability and water quality by reducing nutrient and sediment loss from farms. I hope a significant number of farms can be helped and significant improvements in water quality are realized.

At our meeting it was explained that up to 28 percent of the block grants can go towards grant administration (3 percent), grant management (10 percent), and outreach and education (15 percent). Does the annual cost estimate of \$354 million include in our report also include the above costs/cost categories or should this number be increased by 28 percent? I have no way of knowing if 28 percent is a high or low but I assume someone has or will work to confirm the accuracy of these projected expenses to ensure PA gets maximum value from these expenditures. I think PennVest allows a project administration/management fee that is equal to 4 percent of the cost of a project.

The report should encourage county conservation districts to actively pursue public private partnerships as part of their efforts to deliver conservation to the farm level through these block grants. These partnerships can be established by requesting qualifications and proposals from interested parties. Key performance metrics (KPMs) should be connected to the block grants so performance can be measured.

Thank you and the rest of the team for all of your work on this report.

Best regards,

Chris

On Jun 25, 2019, at 3:18 PM, John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com> wrote:

Good afternoon, everyone,

This is a friendly reminder that any concerns with or suggested changes to the draft version of the Workgroup's final report should be provided to me by **no later than close of business day tomorrow**.

So far, I've only received suggested changes from Doug Goodlander, which you all should have received. By the process we have been employing in the effort to produce a final version of our Workgroup report, all portions of the draft in which no concern or suggestion is offered is presumed to be approved without change by the Workgroup.

Although I would welcome any specific language changes you want to offer, I'm not necessarily asking any of you who believes changes or additions should be made to

draft it. If you want something changed but don't have specific language to offer, I will try to work with you in drafting language consistent with your wishes (within reason, of course).

I would also like to alert you to a development that occurred at the recent meeting of the Workgroup Co-Chairs. Our revised draft report (page 19 of Version 3) includes a recommendation for development of a Center for Agriculture Environmental Excellence to provide guidance and help coordinate local and regional actions and management of resources in implementing the agricultural conservation measures recommended in the Phase 3 WIP. Other Workgroups have made similar recommendations for a local or regional coordinator of effort and resource management, relative to conservation measures those Workgroups are recommending. Our Co-Chairs will be meeting with other Workgroup Co-Chairs on July 9 to discuss the possibility of having one entity, rather than multiple entities, carry out the responsibility of regional and local coordination and resource management, and perform its responsibility over a broader spectrum of conservation measures than any one sector. We may need to consider and offer comment on what emerges conceptually from that meeting

Again, if you have any questions, concerns or suggestions on the version 3 of the draft, please don't hesitate to call me (717-731-3547) or email me (jjbell@pfb.com).

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel
Government Affairs and Communications Division
717.731.3547

<image001.png>

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.

From: John J. Bell

Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2019 6:37 PM

To: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>; dgoodland@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; mzr154@psu.edu;

Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) jjbell@hotmail.com; Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) jjbell@centurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com; Ex. 6 Personal Privacy (PP) jbell@embarqmail.com;
jdrafarm@frontier.com; kbrown@pa.gov; jrharry@pennag.com; bchain@cbf.org; jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org;
jshuler@farmerspride.com; chriss@teamaginc.com

Cc: Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Trentacoste, Emily
<trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>

Subject: Version 3 of Ag Workgroup Final Report Per Consideration at June 10 Workgroup meeting

Importance: High

Hi, Folks,

Attached is the third version of the Workgroup's draft final report for your review and consideration. This version attempts capture discussion and resolution of matters considered at the June 10 meeting, relative to the text highlighted in the 2nd Version (circulated to Workgroup members in my email of June 7).

The first attachment contains the draft text for the 3rd version of the report. The areas shaded in blue identify the areas that were considered for change and the draft changes that are being offered in response to the discussion and resolution of matters considered at the June 10 meeting.

For some areas, the draft change reflects the language changes crafted at the meeting. For others, the change reflects my attempt to capture what was agreed or consented to in concept at the meeting.

The second attachment contains explanatory notes for numerous passages of revised text shaded in blue. Each of the explanatory notes have a number that corresponds with the number appearing in the draft document alongside the text revision in the draft document. This is to help you identify and match up text and explanatory note. For example, the explanatory note for text revision identified by the number 4 in the draft report will be note 4 in the notes document.

There are still a few changes in text language or table figures that will need to be performed by our technical support staff (Jill, Jordan and Emily). These are specifically noted in the body of the draft, and are identified in those areas to which they apply.

Those portions of text that do not appear in blue shading were included in prior draft versions and received no negative comment or expression of concern from Workgroup members. **I will note again that portions without shading are presumed to be acceptable to Workgroup members, and will be part of the final version of our report, unless a question or concern is raised.** So if you do have a problem with any of those areas, speak now, or forever hold your peace.

For the good of the order (and my mental well-being), I am requesting any questions, objections or suggested changes to the 3rd Version be provided to me by close of business next Wednesday, June 26.

Please don't hesitate to contact me by email or phone (direct office line: 717-731-3547) if you have any questions on regarding the contents of either of these attached documents.

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel

Government Affairs and Communications Division

717.731.3547

<image001.png>

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.